

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Claim objections

Claims 4 and 6 presently stand rejected as being of improper independent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 4 and 6 have been amended in the interest of improved grammar and clarity. It is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 6 each provide further limitations to the method recited in claim 1. Claim 1 recites that first injection molding pieces are relocated to an accompanying second mold impression.

Applicant notes that first molding pieces are formed in first mold impressions between the first mold series and the third mold series, as well as between the second mold series and the third mold series. In the case of claim 4, once the first mold pieces have been formed, they remain in the first mold impressions of the first and second mold series, while the mutual position of the mold parts of the first and second mold parts with respect to the third series is changed. Conversely, in the case of claim 6, the first molding pieces remain on the mold part of the third series, while the position of the first and second series relative to the third series changes.

Thus, it can be recognized that claims 4 and 6 each describe different methods of performing the repositioning recited in claim 1, and so each of claims 4 and 6 provide further limitations to claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 6 are of proper dependent form, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is objected to as being of improper independent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 9 provides, essentially, that the third series of mold parts is fixed, while the first and second series of mold parts are rotated (relative to the third series). Claim 7 (from which claim 9 depends) provides simply that the first and second series of mold parts alternately cooperate with the third series of mold parts by a rotational movement whereby the first and second series are repositioned

relative to the third series. Thus, claim 9 further limits claim 7 by establishing that it is the first and second series of mold parts are that rotated, while the third series remains fixed. It is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is of proper dependent form, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is objected to because of certain informalities, and claim 13 is objected to as being in improper dependent form. The examiner is referred to the preliminary amendment filed on October 28, 2003, concurrently with the present application, wherein claim 7 is amended to clearly depend from claim 1, and claims 12 and 13 are amended to eliminate the multiple dependencies. In view of the preliminary amendment, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-3 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 14-16 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by Bodmer et al (U.S. 6,783,346). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 of the present application sets forth a method for manufacturing injection molding pieces comprising two components, comprising the steps of 1) forming a first mold injection piece of a first component in a first mold impression; 2) putting the mold injection piece in a second mold impression; and 3) providing a second component on the first mold injection piece to form the second mold injection piece. These steps are conducted using a mold that features 1) at least three series of mold parts; 2) each series has at least a *first mold part* which can form a wall of the first mold impression *and* a *second mold part* which can form a wall of a second mold impression; 3) the first and second series of mold parts work alternately in conjunction with the third series of mold parts; 4) at least one *first mold impression and at least one second mold impression* are formed each time either of the first or second series of mold parts work in conjunction with the third series; and 5) during alternating presentation of the second or first series of mold parts, each first injection molding piece is transferred from a first mold impression to a second mold impression.

It is respectfully submitted that Bodmer fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 1 of the present invention recites that *each series* has *first and second mold parts*, forming a wall of *first and second mold impressions*.

Bodmer provides no teaching or suggestion that *any* mold series (mold carrier) has at least a *first mold part* which can form a wall of the first mold impression *and a second mold part* which can form a wall of a second mold impression. At best, Bodmer provides that “cavities [...] of the third and of the fourth half-molds 10, 11 are each implemented as double.” However, Bodmer does not provide any teaching that the “double” cavities are directed to different mold impressions, rather than simply a doubling in number of cavities according to a single mold impression.

Claim 1 of the present application also provides that at least one first mold impression *and* at least one second mold impression are formed *each time either of* the first or second series of mold parts work in conjunction with the third series. Bodmer fails to disclose or suggest such an arrangement. In other words, each of the first and second series is able to form *both first and second* mold impressions.

Instead, Bodmer states that “in a second step, the article made out of the first plastic material after solidifying [...] is brought from the *first cavity in the zone of the first parting plane* into a *second cavity in the zone of a second parting plane*, which is *located at a distance from the first parting plane* [...]” (Bodmer; col. 5, lines 7-13) (emphasis added). Thus, only a single mold impression is formed by any one mold series. Clearly, a first mold impression *and* a second mold impression *are not* formed *each time either of* a first or second series of mold parts work in conjunction with a third series, according to Bodmer’s disclosure.

The present invention provides for the use of fewer mold series (three instead of four as disclosed in Bodmer in view of respective illustrated embodiments), resulting in a reduction of cost of the mold. Also, the present invention provides for a reduction in the production time of molding pieces with two components, since the mutual repositioning of

the first injection mold parts in a first series of mold parts and the recovery of finished components can be obtained during the injection molding of components in the second series of mold parts.

For at least these reasons, Bodmer fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1 of the present application, and therefore cannot anticipate claim 1, or any of the dependent claims 2-16 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 are allowable over the cited reference, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 6 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bodmer in view of Boucherie (U.S. 6,379,139) (hereafter Boucherie '139), and claims 5 and 7-11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bodmer in view of Boucherie (EP 678 368)(hereafter Boucherie '368). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Each of claims 4-11 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Bodmer because Bodmer fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that neither Boucherie '139 nor Boucherie '368 supplement the deficiencies of Bodmer with respect to the elements set forth in claim 1, and therefore neither Bodmer in view of Boucherie '139 nor Bodmer in view of Boucherie '368 form a prima facie case of obviousness of any of the dependent claims 4-11. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-11 are allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-16 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.


Application No.: 10/693,983  
Examiner: M. A. Huson  
Art Unit: 1732

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date:

Respectfully submitted,

  
JOHN R. SCHAEFFER  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,921